

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 9, 2006. Claims 12, 14, 27, 29, 42 and 44 remain pending in the application, with Claims 15, 30 and 45 having been cancelled herein. Claims 12, 27 and 42 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 14, 15, 27, 29, 30, 42, 44 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,353,848 (Morris) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,858,000 (Lu) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103 (Fernandez). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns controlling direction of an image pickup device (e.g., a camera) to obtain an image from which an electronic address (e.g., a URL or an e-mail address) can be accessed to display a homepage corresponding to the address. According to the invention, a control command input by a user is output to mechanically control the direction of the image input device. Then, an image obtained by the image input device in accordance with the control command is received and analyzed to determine whether or not it includes a predetermined image. If so, then an address of the homepage is extracted corresponding to the predetermined image and the address is accessed to display the homepage on a display device if a user performs a process to designate the predetermined image.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a system for accessing an address to display a homepage, comprising an operation device that outputs a control command input by a user to mechanically control an image pickup direction of an image pickup device for the image pickup device to obtain an image, a receiving device that

receives an image obtained by the image pickup device which is controlled based on the control command of the direction of the image pickup device, a monitoring device that determines whether the image received by the receiving device includes a predetermined image, an extracting device that extracts an address of the homepage corresponding to the predetermined image when the monitoring device determines that the predetermined image is included in the image received by the receiving device, and an accessing device that accesses the address extracted by the extracting device corresponding to the predetermined image to display the homepage on a display device when the monitoring device determines that the received image includes the predetermined image and if a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image.

Claims 27 and 42 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 12.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 12, 27 and 42, and particularly, at least the features of outputting a control command, input by a user to mechanically control an image pickup direction of an image pickup device for the image pickup device to obtain an image, determining whether an image received from the image pickup device, controlled in accordance with the control command, includes a predetermined image, if so, accessing an extracted address of a homepage corresponding to the predetermined image if the received image includes the predetermined image and if a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image, and displaying the homepage corresponding to the accessed address on a display device.

Morris merely discloses that application software is used to remotely control a

camera. The control is provided between a server and a client so that the client can perform various functions on the camera. One function is to control the camera so that images captured by the camera are transmitted to the client. Another function is to control an aiming device attached to the camera so as to control the field of view of the camera. However, as readily admitted by the Examiner, Morris fails to teach the features of a) monitoring whether a received image includes a predetermined image, b) extracting an address corresponding to the predetermined image, and c) accessing the address corresponding to the predetermined image if a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image.

Lu merely discloses a technique for identifying individuals in an audience. Images of individuals are extracted from an image of the audience and compared to stored images in order to identify the individuals. Thus, Lu, at best, may arguably be seen to monitor for a predetermined image, but as the Examiner rightly concedes, Lu fails to teach the features of a) accessing an address corresponding to the predetermined image if a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image. As such, the proposed combination of Morris and Lu, assuming *arguendo* that the requisite motivation to combine the references can be found, may have, at best, resulted in controlling a camera to transmit images to a client, and then performing individual recognition of persons in an audience of a image taken by the camera. However, very clearly, the proposed combination still lacks the claimed features of accessing an address of a homepage corresponding to the recognized individual, and displaying the homepage on a display device.

Fernandez merely uses fixed or mobile sensors to detect images, and when an image is detected, it may be sent to another device via any one of a number of means (e.g., voice

message, e-mail, etc.). Although the Examiner equates the foregoing with the claimed accessing step/mean, Applicant believes that the Examiner's position is somewhat misplaced. Specifically, Applicant believes that the claimed feature of accessing an address of a homepage corresponding to the predetermined image if a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image is simply different from transmitting an image to another device and therefore, Applicant believes the rejections are improper. Nonetheless, Fernandez, like Morris and Lu, also fails to teach the claimed features of accessing an address of a homepage corresponding to a predetermined image and displaying the accessed homepage on a display device. Accordingly, the proposed combination of Morris, Lu and Fernandez would not have resulted in the present invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Claims 12, 27 and 42, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 123066v1